



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,731	01/22/2004	Paul M. Moody	260-011 LOT9-2003-0112US1	5629
44185 7590 08/09/2007 LOTUS AND RATIONAL SOFTWARE McGuinness & Manaras LLP 125 NAGOG PARK ACTON, MA 01720			EXAMINER ABDUL-ALI, OMAR R	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/762,731	Applicant(s) MOODY ET AL.	
	Examiner Omar Abdul-Ali	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 May 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the response filed May 1, 2007. Amended Claims 1-29 are pending and have been considered below.

1. Examiner's Note: The amendments to the specification and Fig. 23 overcome the objections. The objections have been withdrawn.
2. Examiner's Note: The previous rejections of Claims 1-29 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 29 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A carrier wave is a form of energy and does not fall within one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, 10-15, 19-25, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. (US 5,793,365) in view of Curbow et al. (US 7,076,043).

Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 29: Tang discloses a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members, further disclosing obtaining a plurality of user representations corresponding to respective one of a plurality of users with whom said selected remote user recently communicated (column 8, lines 40-45), but does not explicitly disclose the users communicated across a plurality of different communication applications. Curbow discloses a similar system and method for sensing and communicating the recent social networking activities of a remote user that reports the device (i.e. phone, PDA) that the user has recently used to communicate with other users (column 6, lines 51-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose a plurality of different communication applications in Tang. One would have been motivated to disclose a plurality of different communication applications in order to inform the user of the communication activities of other users.

Tang also does not explicitly disclose that the plurality of user representations are presented in the order in which the user communicated with each user. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2178

was made to present these representations in chronological order. One would have been motivated to present the representations chronologically in order to determine the order of the recent collaborative activities of a remote user.

Claims 2, 11, and 20: Tang discloses a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 1, 10, and 19 above, further comprising:

- a. each of said plurality of user representations comprises an image of said corresponding one of said plurality of users with whom said selected remote user recently communicated (column 8, lines 40-45).

Claims 3, 12, and 21: Tang discloses a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 2, 11, and 20 above, further comprising:

- a. each of said plurality of user representations comprises an indication of a communication application used for communication between said one of said plurality of users and said selected remote user (column 8, lines 40-45).

Claims 4, 13, and 22: Tang discloses a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 2, 11, and 20 above, further comprising obtaining a second plurality of user representations, each corresponding to a respective one of a plurality of users with whom a local user recently

Art Unit: 2178

communicated, and displaying the representations simultaneously (column 5, lines 13-43). But, Tang does not explicitly disclose that the plurality of user representations are presented in the order in which the user communicated with each user. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to present these representations in chronological order. One would have been motivated to present the representations chronologically in order to determine the order of the recent collaborative activities of a remote user.

Claims 5, 14, and 23: Tang discloses a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 2, 11, and 20 above, further comprising:

- a. each of said second plurality of user representations comprises an image of said corresponding one of said plurality of users with whom said local user communicated (column 8, lines 40-45)

Claims 6, 15, and 24: Tang discloses a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 5, 14, and 23 above, further comprising:

- a. each of said plurality of user representations comprises an indication of a communication application used for communication between said one of said plurality of users and said selected remote user (column 8, lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. (US 5,793,365) in view of Curbow et al. (US 7,076,043) and further in view of Godefroid et al. (US 6,697,840).

Claims 7, 16, and 25: Tang and Curbow disclose a system and method providing a computer user interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 1, 10, and 19 above, but neither reference explicitly discloses presenting an interface to said local user, wherein said interface enables said local user to specify that information regarding communication activities of said local user that are to be shared with remote users. Godefroid discloses a similar system for presence awareness in collaborative systems that further discloses controlling remote user access to private data (column 6, lines 12-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify whether the communication activities of a local user are allowed to be accessed by remote users. One would have been motivated to restrict access to information regarding their collaborative activities for privacy purposes.

Claims 8, 17, and 26: Tang and Curbow disclose a system and method providing a computer interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 1, 10, and 19 above, and Godefroid further discloses allowing or disallowing queries regarding the recent collaborative activities of the user (column 6, lines 12-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2178

the invention was made to specify which communication activities of a local user are allowed to be viewed by remote users. One would have been motivated to restrict access to information regarding their collaborative activities for privacy purposes.

Claims 9, 18, and 27: Tang and Curbow disclose a system and method providing a computer interface enabling access to distributed workgroup members as in Claims 1, 10, and 19 above, and Godefroid further discloses allowing or disallowing queries from specific users regarding the recent collaborative activities of the user (column 6, lines 12-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify which users may be presented information regarding the communication activities of a local user. One would have been motivated to specify which users can view information regarding their collaborative activities for privacy purposes.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments filed on May 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim 29: Applicants argue the rejection of Claim 29 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response to Applicant's argument, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 29 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 41, line 6, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g.,

Art Unit: 2178

floppy disks and hard drives) and intangible embodiments (e.g. carrier wave signaling techniques). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 29: Applicants arguments which pertain to Tang et al., have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on Tang et al. in view of Curbow et al., as applied above.

Claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27: Applicant's arguments which pertain to Tang et al. in view of Godefroid et al. have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on Tang et al. in view of Curbow et al. and further in view of Godefroid et al.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2178


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Abdul-Ali whose telephone number is 571-270-1694. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri(Alternate Fridays Off) 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OAA
7/23/2007



STEPHEN HONG
ADVISORY PATENT EXAMINER